कोल इंडिया लिमिटेड ने 1997-98 में निर्धारित लक्ष्य को प्राप्त कर लिया है। तथापि 1996-97 के दौरान वास्तविक उत्पादन लक्ष्य से थोड़ा कम हुआ है। लक्ष्य प्राप्त न किए जाने के कारणों में अन्य बातों के अलावा, झांजरा और सतग्राम पी एस एल डब्ल्यू फेसेज हेतु लांगवाल की प्राप्ति में हो रहे विलंब, भूमि की अनुपलब्धता, कोटाडीह और मूनीडीह पी एस एल डब्ल्यू फेसेज आदि में गंभीर स्ट्राटा नियंत्रण समस्या शामिल है।

(ग) कोल इंडिया लिमिटेड में पिछले दो वर्षों के दौरान कुल उत्पादन लागत की तुलना में अर्जित राजस्व का ब्यौरा नीचे दर्शाया गया है:

(आकंड़े करोड़ रु० में)

	1997-98	1996-97
बिक्री के माध्यम से अर्जित राजस्व (निवल-लेवी छोड़कर)	15,409.33	13,405.76
कोयले का कुल उत्पादन (लागत (रु० टन)	480.81	442.06

Encroachment in Ridge areas by the Defence Ministry

796. SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some complaints regarding the Defence Ministry's encroachment on the Ridge in Delhi have been made, where any kind of construction has been stopped;

(b) if so, how old are the encroachments; and

(c) what action has been taken by Government to remove them?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES): (a) to (c) No, Sir. No encroachment had been made nor any constrcution undertaken by the Ministry of Defence on the Ridge in Delhi.

Houses leased by Delhi Cantonment Board

797. SHRI RAJUBHAI A. PARMAR: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether some houses in Gopinath Bazar Area in Delhi Cantonment have been given on lease to civilians by the Delhi Cantonment Board; if so, the details thereof; and

(b) whether Government have any proposal to shift the said residents to some other areas, by not renewing the said lease; if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES): (a) While 14 sites have been given on lease by the Government, no houses in the Gopinath Bazar Area in Delhi Cantonment have been given on lease. Details are given in the Statement (*See* below).

(b) Does not arise.

Statement

S. No.	Survey No.	Date of expiry of the lease term	Remarks
1.	52/1	30.01.1993	Action for renewal
2	52/2	31.01.1993	of those leases
3.	52/4	14.01.2017	which have expired
4.	52/5	28.02.1987	is being taken in
5.	52/6	30.09.2018	some cases the
6.	52/7	30.04.1991	action is held up
7.	52/8	31.08.1990	because of dispute

S. No.	Survey No.	Date of expiry of the lease term	Remarks
8.	52/1	30.09.1988	of the legal heirs.
9.	52/2	30.09.1988	
10.	52/10	14.07.1990	
11.	52/11	30.09.2003	
12.	52/15	09.06.2022	
13.	52/16	13.11.1992	
14.	52/14	24.05.1974	Resumed on 30.03.1984

Action or reported link of Naval Officers with foreign arms dealers

798. SHRI AKHILESH DAS:
SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that while reports about links of some high ranking Naval Officers with some foreign arms dealers and enjoying them hospitality brought to the notice of Ministry of Defence in 1997-98 were ignored, similar reports regarding some junior rank officers were taken cognisance of and proceeded against;

(b) whether such former officers have been given promotions, while those who brought home such complicity with foreign arms dealers were dismissed; and

(c) whether Government have since instituted any inquiry into these affairs?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES): (a) to (c) A Vice Admiral had submitted statutory representations through normal service channels for redressal of his grievances, inter alia, for expunction of certain adverse remarks recorded by the former Chief of the Naval Staff in two of his ACRs. The officer thereafter filed a Writ Petition before the Calcutta High Court. The High Court directed that the Central Government through the Ministry of Defence shall look into the entire matter.

On the directions of the Court, the Ministry of Defence considered the representations of the officer after obtaining detailed comments from the Naval HQrs. In one of the ACRs, it ha been observed that the officer, on a private visit abroad, had stayed with and accepted the hospitality of a retired Naval Officer who was stated to be an agent. The officer, in his explanation, had clarified that the retired Naval Officer with who he had stayed was his childhood friend and coursemate, that they were brought up together and have been friends as well as family friends for many years and the entire Navy was aware of it. The officer further explained that he had kept the Naval Attache, Moscow, informed that he was staying with the ex-officer and that he would not have done so if there had been any design on his part. After taking into account all aspects of the case, the adverse remarks endorsed by the former Chief of the Naval Staff were expunged by the Government on 12.8.1998.

Several anonymous complaints were received against a Rear Admiral, when the promotion case of the officer was under consideration in the Ministry of Defence. Since the allegations were specific, the Naval HQrs were requested to furnish their comments. Naval HQrs instead of furnishing their comments maintained that anonymous complaints need not be enquired into and reiterated that officer's case for promotion be